

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3, 8-9, 11-16, and 18-20 are pending.

Claims 4-7, 10, 17, and 21-25 have been cancelled.

Claims 26-44 have been added.

In the final Office Action dated January 23, 2007, claims 1, 2, 8, 11, 13 15, 18, 20 22, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by “Hierarchical Pixel Bar Charts” (Keim 2002); claims 3-5, 9, 10, 12, 16, 17, 19, 23, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Keim 2002; and claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Keim 2002 in View of “Designing Pixel Oriented Visualization Techniques: Theory and Applications” (Keim 2000).

In the Decision on Appeal dated February 26, 2009, the Board found that “a visual boundary is created by the height and width of the bar for a particular set of values.” 2/26/2009 Decision on Appeal at 9. To further distinguish the visual boundary of claim 1 from the height and/or width of each bar in Keim 2002, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite determining a first visual boundary for representing a first aggregate of a set of values of a variable of pixels depicted in a pixel-oriented graph, where the first aggregate of the set of values of the variable is computed by applying an aggregate function on the set of values of a variable. The height and/or width of Keim 2002 does not represent an aggregate that is computed by applying an aggregate function on the set of values of the variable of pixels depicted in a pixel-oriented graph.

Support for the above amendment of claim 1 can be found on at least page 6 of the specification, which refers to applying various different types of aggregate functions, such as an average function or a median function, to provide the aggregate.

Moreover, Keim 2002 does not disclose that the first visual boundary is selectable from among plural types of visual boundaries based on received input. The height and/or width of each bar are fixed line boundaries. Moreover, even if the average/median lines shown on Fig. 12 of Keim 2002 are considered to be visual boundaries, there is no teaching in Keim 2002 that the average/median lines are selectable from among plural types of visual boundaries based on received input.

Therefore, it is believed that claim 1 is allowable over Keim 2002. Independent claim 20 is also similarly allowable over Keim 2002.

Independent claim 13 is also allowable, since Keim 2002 does not disclose a visual boundary for representing an aggregate that is computed by applying an aggregate function on a set of values of a variable. Nor does Keim 2002 provide any hint of a visual boundary being selectable to have one of plural different shapes.

Therefore, it is believed that claim 13 is also allowable over Keim 2002.


Dependent claims, including newly added dependent claims 26-44, are further allowable for at least the same reasons as corresponding base claims. Moreover, in view of the allowability of the base claims, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejections of dependent claims have been overcome.

Allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 (200209329-1).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 27, 2009



Dan C. Hu
Registration No. 40,025
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
Telephone: (713) 468-8880
Facsimile: (713) 468-8883